



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,210	01/02/2004	Kenneth K. Cyr	CRNI.111423	6655

46169 7590 10/12/2007
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
Intellectual Property Department
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER

DUNHAM, JASON B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,210	CYR ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason B. Dunham	Art Unit 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 10, 2007 has been entered. Applicant amended claims 1,3,6,15,17,20,27,29, and 32. Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBusk (US 5,682,728) in view of Zimmerman (US 2004/0098286).

Referring to claim 1. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman discloses a system for automatically fulfilling orders for clinically related supplies, comprising:

- An interface to a supply chain engine, the supply chain engine automatically generating at least one order for clinically related supplies based upon supply consumption data derived from documentation of at least one clinical event

reported from at least one clinically related site, the supply consumption data including items used or consumed during the at least one clinical event (Zimmerman: abstract and paragraph 47); and

- A fulfillment engine, communicating with the interface to the supply chain engine, the fulfillment engine triggering delivery of clinically related supplies based at least upon the at least one order for clinically related supplies (DeBusk: column 4, lines 51-65).

The examiner notes that DeBusk discloses generating orders based upon specific patient's needs in a clinical event such as surgery (DeBusk: column 6, lines 47-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the system of DeBusk to have included ordering supplies based upon usage in a clinical event, as taught by Zimmerman, in order to streamline supply chain processes (Zimmerman: paragraph 47). The examiner also notes that the cited passages from the prior art are not intended to be limiting, the prior art must be considered as a whole.

Referring to claim 2. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the clinically related site comprises a hospital facility (DeBusk: column 1, lines 13-39).

Referring to claim 3. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the supply consumption data includes clinically available quantities of surgical devices (DeBusk: column 1, lines 36-48, column 2, lines 29-40, and column 6, lines 47 - 59).

Referring to claim 4. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the supply chain engine generates at least one clinical supply order based upon at least one clinical quantity threshold (DeBusk: column 3, lines 25 – 50).

Referring to claim 5. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the at least one order for clinically related supplies comprises a purchase order (DeBusk: column 2, line 41 – column 3, line 24).

Referring to claims 6-7. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the supply consumption data includes supply codes captured in the at least one clinically related site and are manually entered codes (DeBusk: column 3, lines 25-50).

Referring to claim 8. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the at least one order comprises a plurality of orders, and the fulfillment engine aggregates the order for clinically related supplies for delivery (DeBusk: figure 3).

Referring to claim 9. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the orders for clinically related supplies are aggregated for a plurality of clinical departments (DeBusk: column 3, lines 25-50).

Referring to claim 10. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the at least one order for clinically related supplies is associated with an individual patient supply record (DeBusk: column 6, lines 47-59).

Referring to claim 11-12. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the fulfillment engine triggers delivery of the at least one order for clinically related supplies based upon the at least one order for clinically related supplies and upon a set of rules (DeBusk: column 4, lines 51-65), the set of rules comprising a set of selectors based upon patient condition information (DeBusk: column 4, lines 30-65).

Referring to claims 13-14. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman further discloses a system wherein the fulfillment engine is local or remote to the at least one clinically related site (DeBusk: column 5, lines 6-21).

Referring to claims 15 - 38. Claims 15-25 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above. The combination of DeBusk and Zimmerman discloses a method and apparatus according to claims 15-38.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason B. Dunham whose telephone number is 571-272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

Art Unit: 3625

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JBD
Patent Examiner
9/26/07

MATTHEW S. GART
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600